

Jayme Jonas

From: Greg & Carol Helland [gregandcarol.helland@verizon.net]
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2007 12:24 AM
To: Planning Commission
Subject: Comments on the Overlake Neighborhood Plan
Importance: High

Please find attached our written comments for inclusion prior to the close of the public hearing record on the above-referenced policy and development guide amendments.

07/02/2007

June 18, 2007

Redmond Planning Commissioners

via e-mail

Re: Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update

The Overlake Neighborhood Plan update process has not been adequately informed by neighborhood input or transportation and visual analysis. The process should be slowed down and it should involve residential as well as commercial stakeholders. Before the Planning Commission makes a final recommendation to the City Council, the process should also be informed by additional transportation analysis, including direction from the outcome of the scheduled fall vote on light rail, by visual analysis and by cross-jurisdictional collaboration with the City of Bellevue.

Public Participation

Active participation (FW-1) and strong communication between residents and the City (FW-18) are required elements of the Participation Framework Policies contained in the Comprehensive Plan. This did not occur as part of the Overlake Neighborhood Plan update process.

The scope of the changes were not adequately described to "encourage active public participation by all members of the Redmond Community" as is required when planning for Redmond's future (FW-1). Staff presentations to the Planning Commission and the Technical Committee report describe the proposed amendments as "clarifications and enhancements" to policy adopted in 1999. Technical Committee Report; p. 1. Detailed review of the proposed changes and the SEIS indicates much more substantive modifications are proposed.

First, map changes were not adequately depicted in notice materials. The Viewpoint Neighborhood was subsumed into the Overlake Neighborhood as part of the original 1999 amendment package. The neighborhood boundaries were changed so that interrelated impacts and benefits could be more fully analyzed and addressed. As a result, the existing Comprehensive Plan map for the Overlake Neighborhood includes the Viewpoint area within its boundaries. The current proposed action re-segments the Viewpoint area from the Overlake Neighborhood and reverses a component of the vision that was adopted in 1999. SEIS, p. 45. However, the maps contained in the notification materials already exclude the Viewpoint area from the Overlake Neighborhood. The maps included with the notice materials pre-suppose the map amendment that is part of the proposed action currently before the Planning Commission.

Second, the planning staff presupposed the outcome of the map change and effectively excluded Viewpoint area residents from involvement in the Overlake Neighborhood process. As a result, residents of the Viewpoint area of the Overlake Neighborhood were not given the opportunity to be involved in the review, preparation and adoption of the neighborhood plan as required by NP-2:

- Residents of the Overlake Neighborhood were not included in the dialogue. Meetings with stakeholders focused exclusively on property owners or managers, commercial brokers, business owners or managers, and employees in Overlake. SEIS p.10; para. 1.7.1.1. The SEIS indicates that public notices were sent regarding Charettes to residents of Overlake and Grasslawn. However, no general notice mailing occurred to residents of the Viewpoint area of the Overlake Neighborhood. Verified via telephone conversation with Lori Peckol, Policy Planning Manager.

- The conversation regarding the future of the Overlake Neighborhood is not balanced. To-date, the conversation has been one-sided: dominated by the stakeholders who stand to benefit from the increased dimensional flexibility and allocation of square footage without engaging the residential stakeholders who will bear significant impacts associated with the growth proposed.

The Viewpoint and Overlake residential CAC's are constituted and preparing to begin their evaluation of the residential areas of the Overlake Neighborhood. These volunteers should be briefed on the Overlake Neighborhood Plan and given time to make a recommendation to the Planning Commission before the Planning Commission completes their final recommendation to Council. Participation from the neighborhood as a whole (including the residential stakeholders) did not occur for the development of the Overlake Neighborhood Update and is not consistent with the culture of dialogue contemplated by Framework Policy FW-3. The public participation and outreach that has occurred is not consistent with the requirements of the Comprehensive Plan.

Transportation

Transportation impacts associated with residential units and commercial square footage must be evaluated for the entire Overlake Neighborhood.

- Impacts on the Grasslawn Neighborhood were evaluated.
- Impacts on the Viewpoint area of the Overlake Neighborhood were not evaluated. A significant number of residential units are contemplated to occur in Overlake Village as a result of proposed new dimensional flexibility. Yet, there is no analysis that describes the impacts to residents of Viewpoint who travel through Overlake Village (on NE 24th Street) to gain access to the regional transportation system (SR 520).

Transportation analysis that includes Viewpoint is necessary for the Planning Commission to fully understand the range of impacts on Redmond residents and to ensure implementation strategies (including infrastructure financing, developer contributions and development phasing) are in place at the time of plan adoption. Additional transportation analysis is necessary to identify the improvements that would be needed to protect neighborhoods (FW-25). No additional residential or office development should be entitled before an appropriate financial plan is prepared and projects are funded to support growth so that the City can ensure that the cost of capital facility improvements are borne in proportion to the benefit receive (FW-29).

Action should wait for the outcome of the Sound Transit light rail vote in fall 2007. Increases in both commercial square footage and housing units are likely to have significant impacts on transportation from the single family areas of the Overlake Neighborhood to regional transportation facilities (SR 520 and I-90 via West Lake Sammamish Parkway). Transportation analysis included in the SEIS assumes light rail will be in place. Since the vote on construction of Sound Transit light rail is scheduled for Fall 2007, the most prudent course of action would be to delay the Planning Commission recommendation on the plan until the transit vote is taken. At a minimum, additional height to facilitate housing and additional commercial square footage should not be entitled until transportation is planned and funded. Land use must be linked to transportation infrastructure.

Visual Analysis

The housing unit targets adopted in 1999 for Overlake Village cannot be achieved without additional building height allowances. Amendments requested by Group Health propose height limits up to 12 stories. Impacts associated with the increased height limits cannot be evaluated by the Planning Commission (or stakeholders involved in the process) in the absence of a visual analysis that accurately depicts the ultimate heights that are proposed.

Cross-Jurisdictional Collaboration

The cities of Redmond and Bellevue have an obligation to coordinate planning along their jurisdictional boundaries. At the June 13 meeting, Planning Commission members acknowledged that most residents do not know where the jurisdictional city limits are for the City of Redmond. However, residents should not have to know this information - jurisdictional lines should be transparent. As contemplated in Comprehensive Plan policy FW-25, interests of Redmond and Bellevue and nearby residential areas should all be taken into account when planning for the transportation future of this area. Bellevue is only about six months behind in its planning efforts for areas of Overlake that lie within Bellevue jurisdiction. New commercial square footage could not be entitled in the Redmond area of Overlake until 2012 in the absence of an amendment to the BROTS interlocal agreement between Bellevue and Redmond. It is irresponsible for these planning efforts to be run out of sync – they should run in collaboration in an effort to optimize regional transportation investment in the Overlake area (irrespective of jurisdictional lines) and to minimize impacts on and maintain stability of adjacent residential areas in both cities.

The Overlake Neighborhood plan is an example of balkanized planning. The process has divided commercial property owners and residential property owners, and Redmond planning from Bellevue planning. Effective plans include broad stakeholder engagement so that the end product truly reflects a shared vision for the future of a place. The realistic outcome of the current Overlake planning process is that nearby, existing, single family neighborhoods will be impacted by traffic; Redmond and Bellevue will compete for regional transportation infrastructure and funding; and, some commercial property owners will be up zone winners and some will be losers. However, these outcomes should be decided with the involvement of the full array of property stakeholders, with the benefit of the best information possible and with the good of the region (not just a single jurisdiction or a single stakeholder group) firmly in mind. Without these essential parts, the vision will not be shared and it will be difficult, if not impossible, to implement. Redmond should be a leader in collaborative planning for the benefit of its residents.

Redmond is committed to remaining a community of good neighbors, working together and with others in the region to implement a common vision for Redmond's future. (Comprehensive Plan; Redmond Goals). The Planning Commission should help to ensure that this planning effort is a success. Slow down the process, involve the residential stakeholders from the CACs that have been formed for the residential areas of the Overlake Neighborhood (including Viewpoint), sync the Redmond planning effort with the Bellevue planning effort for the Overlake area, expand the transportation analysis, be informed by the outcome of the Sound Transit light rail vote and require a visual analysis that depicts the height of the building forms that you are being asked to enable. Then, develop a recommendation that takes into account the good of the community as a whole (FW-2).

We appreciate the time and commitment that you make as Planning Commissioner and appreciate your consideration of the issues raised in this letter.

Respectfully,

Carol and Greg Helland
2626 – 181st Ave NE
Viewpoint Area of the Overlake Neighborhood

Jayme Jonas

From: Alonda Williams [alondaw@microsoft.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2007 8:16 PM
To: Jayme Jonas
Subject: Overlake plan

June 18, 2007

Redmond Planning Commissioners
 c/o Rob Odle, Planning Director

via e-mail

Re: Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update

The Overlake Neighborhood Plan update process has not been adequately informed by neighborhood input or transportation and visual analysis. The process should be slowed down and it should involve residential as well as commercial stakeholders. Before the Planning Commission makes a final recommendation to the City Council, the process should also be informed by additional transportation analysis, including direction from the outcome of the scheduled fall vote on light rail, by visual analysis and by cross-jurisdictional collaboration with the City of Bellevue.

Public Participation

Active participation (FW-1) and strong communication between residents and the City (FW-18) are required elements of the Participation Framework Policies contained in the Comprehensive Plan. This did not occur as part of the Overlake Neighborhood Plan update process.

The scope of the changes were not adequately described to "encourage active public participation by all members of the Redmond Community" as is required when planning for Redmond's future (FW-1). Staff presentations to the Planning Commission and the Technical Committee report describe the proposed amendments as "clarifications and enhancements" to policy adopted in 1999. Technical Committee Report; p. 1. Detailed review of the proposed changes and the SEIS indicates much more substantive modifications are proposed.

First, map changes were not adequately depicted in notice materials. The Viewpoint Neighborhood was subsumed into the Overlake Neighborhood as part of the original 1999 amendment package. The neighborhood boundaries were changed so that interrelated impacts and benefits could be more fully analyzed and addressed. As a result, the existing Comprehensive Plan map for the Overlake Neighborhood includes the Viewpoint area within its boundaries. The current proposed action re-segments the Viewpoint area from the Overlake Neighborhood and reverses a component of the vision that was adopted in 1999. SEIS, p. 45. However, the maps contained in the notification materials already exclude the Viewpoint area from the Overlake Neighborhood. The maps included with the notice materials pre-suppose the map amendment that is part of the proposed action currently before the Planning Commission.

Second, the planning staff presupposed the outcome of the map change and effectively excluded Viewpoint area residents from involvement in the Overlake Neighborhood process. As a result, residents of the Viewpoint area of the Overlake Neighborhood were not given the opportunity to be involved in the review, preparation and adoption of the neighborhood plan as required by NP-2:

- Residents of the Overlake Neighborhood were not included in the dialogue. Meetings with stakeholders focused exclusively on property owners or managers, commercial brokers, business owners or managers, and employees in Overlake. SEIS p.10; para. 1.7.1.1. The SEIS indicates that public notices were sent regarding

06/20/2007

Charettes to residents of Overlake and Grasslawn. However, no general notice mailing occurred to residents of the Viewpoint area of the Overlake Neighborhood. Verified via telephone conversation with Lori Peckol, Policy Planning Manager.

- The conversation regarding the future of the Overlake Neighborhood is not balanced. To-date, the conversation has been one-sided: dominated by the stakeholders who stand to benefit from the increased dimensional flexibility and allocation of square footage without engaging the residential stakeholders who will bear significant impacts associated with the growth proposed.

The Viewpoint and Overlake residential CAC's are constituted and preparing to begin their evaluation of the residential areas of the Overlake Neighborhood. These volunteers should be briefed on the Overlake Neighborhood Plan and given time to make a recommendation to the Planning Commission before the Planning Commission completes their final recommendation to Council. Participation from the neighborhood as a whole (including the residential stakeholders) did not occur for the development of the Overlake Neighborhood Update and is not consistent with the culture of dialogue contemplated by Framework Policy FW-3. The public participation and outreach that has occurred is not consistent with the requirements of the Comprehensive Plan.

Transportation

Transportation impacts associated with residential units and commercial square footage must be evaluated for the entire Overlake Neighborhood.

- Impacts on the Grasslawn Neighborhood were evaluated.
- Impacts on the Viewpoint area of the Overlake Neighborhood were not evaluated. A significant number of residential units are contemplated to occur in Overlake Village as a result of proposed new dimensional flexibility. Yet, there is no analysis that describes the impacts to residents of Viewpoint who travel through Overlake Village (on NE 24th Street) to gain access to the regional transportation system (SR 520).

Transportation analysis that includes Viewpoint is necessary for the Planning Commission to fully understand the range of impacts on Redmond residents and to ensure implementation strategies (including infrastructure financing, developer contributions and development phasing) are in place at the time of plan adoption. Additional transportation analysis is necessary to identify the improvements that would be needed to protect neighborhoods (FW-25). No additional residential or office development should be entitled before an appropriate financial plan is prepared and projects are funded to support growth so that the City can ensure that the cost of capital facility improvements are borne in proportion to the benefit receive (FW-29).

Action should wait for the outcome of the Sound Transit light rail vote in fall 2007. Increases in both commercial square footage and housing units are likely to have significant impacts on transportation from the single family areas of the Overlake Neighborhood to regional transportation facilities (SR 520 and I-90 via West Lake Sammamish Parkway). Transportation analysis included in the SEIS assumes light rail will be in place. Since the vote on construction of Sound Transit light rail is scheduled for Fall 2007, the most prudent course of action would be to delay the Planning Commission recommendation on the plan until the transit vote is taken. At a minimum, additional height to facilitate housing and additional commercial square footage should not be entitled until transportation is planned and funded. Land use must be linked to transportation infrastructure.

Visual Analysis

The housing unit targets adopted in 1999 for Overlake Village cannot be achieved without additional building height allowances. Amendments requested by Group Health propose height limits up to 12 stories. Impacts associated with the increased height limits cannot be evaluated by the Planning Commission (or stakeholders involved in the process) in the absence of a visual analysis that accurately depicts the ultimate heights that are proposed.

Cross-Jurisdictional Collaboration

The cities of Redmond and Bellevue have an obligation to coordinate planning along their jurisdictional boundaries. At the June 13 meeting, Planning Commission members acknowledged that most residents do not know where the jurisdictional city limits are for the City of Redmond. However, residents should not have to know this information -

jurisdictional lines should be transparent. As contemplated in Comprehensive Plan policy FW-25, interests of Redmond and Bellevue and nearby residential areas should all be taken into account when planning for the transportation future of this area. Bellevue is only about six months behind in its planning efforts for areas of Overlake that lie within Bellevue jurisdiction. New commercial square footage could not be entitled in the Redmond area of Overlake until 2012 in the absence of an amendment to the BROTS interlocal agreement between Bellevue and Redmond. It is irresponsible for these planning efforts to be run out of sync – they should run in collaboration in an effort to optimize regional transportation investment in the Overlake area (irrespective of jurisdictional lines) and to minimize impacts on and maintain stability of adjacent residential areas in both cities.

The Overlake Neighborhood plan is an example of balkanized planning. The process has divided commercial property owners and residential property owners, and Redmond planning from Bellevue planning. Effective plans include broad stakeholder engagement so that the end product truly reflects a shared vision for the future of a place. The realistic outcome of the current Overlake planning process is that nearby, existing, single family neighborhoods will be impacted by traffic; Redmond and Bellevue will compete for regional transportation infrastructure and funding; and, some commercial property owners will be up zone winners and some will be losers. However, these outcomes should be decided with the involvement of the full array of property stakeholders, with the benefit of the best information possible and with the good of the region (not just a single jurisdiction or a single stakeholder group) firmly in mind. Without these essential parts, the vision will not be shared and it will be difficult, if not impossible, to implement. Redmond should be a leader in collaborative planning for the benefit of its residents.

Redmond is committed to remaining a community of good neighbors, working together and with others in the region to implement a common vision for Redmond's future. (Comprehensive Plan; Redmond Goals). The Planning Commission should help to ensure that this planning effort is a success. Slow down the process, involve the residential stakeholders from the CACs that have been formed for the residential areas of the Overlake Neighborhood (including Viewpoint), sync the Redmond planning effort with the Bellevue planning effort for the Overlake area, expand the transportation analysis, be informed by the outcome of the Sound Transit light rail vote and require a visual analysis that depicts the height of the building forms that you are being asked to enable. Then, develop a recommendation that takes into account the good of the community as a whole (FW-2).

We appreciate the time and commitment that you make as Planning Commissioner and appreciate your consideration of the issues raised in this letter.

Respectfully,

Alonda and Byron Williams
18612 NE 25th St
Viewpoint Area of the Overlake Neighborhood

06/20/2007

Jayme Jonas

From: bestes4@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2007 10:38 PM
To: Planning Commission
Subject: Overlake Neighborhood Plan update

Planning Commission:

We support the comments reflected by the Hellands, regarding the Overlake Plan update as outlined in the attached document.

Sincerely,

The Browns
The Brae Burn Community
Redmond, WA

06/20/2007

June 18, 2007

Redmond Planning Commissioners
c/o Rob Odle, Planning Director

via e-mail

Re: Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update

The Overlake Neighborhood Plan update process has not been adequately informed by neighborhood input or transportation and visual analysis. The process should be slowed down and it should involve residential as well as commercial stakeholders. Before the Planning Commission makes a final recommendation to the City Council, the process should also be informed by additional transportation analysis, including direction from the outcome of the scheduled fall vote on light rail, by visual analysis and by cross-jurisdictional collaboration with the City of Bellevue.

Public Participation

Active participation (FW-1) and strong communication between residents and the City (FW-18) are required elements of the Participation Framework Policies contained in the Comprehensive Plan. This did not occur as part of the Overlake Neighborhood Plan update process.

The scope of the changes were not adequately described to "encourage active public participation by all members of the Redmond Community" as is required when planning for Redmond's future (FW-1). Staff presentations to the Planning Commission and the Technical Committee report describe the proposed amendments as "clarifications and enhancements" to policy adopted in 1999. Technical Committee Report; p. 1. Detailed review of the proposed changes and the SEIS indicates much more substantive modifications are proposed.

First, map changes were not adequately depicted in notice materials. The Viewpoint Neighborhood was subsumed into the Overlake Neighborhood as part of the original 1999 amendment package. The neighborhood boundaries were changed so that interrelated impacts and benefits could be more fully analyzed and addressed. As a result, the existing Comprehensive Plan map for the Overlake Neighborhood includes the Viewpoint area within its boundaries. The current proposed action re-segments the Viewpoint area from the Overlake Neighborhood and reverses a component of the vision that was adopted in 1999. SEIS, p. 45. However, the maps contained in the notification materials already exclude the Viewpoint area from the Overlake Neighborhood. The maps included with the notice materials pre-suppose the map amendment that is part of the proposed action currently before the Planning Commission.

Second, the planning staff presupposed the outcome of the map change and effectively excluded Viewpoint area residents from involvement in the Overlake Neighborhood process. As a result, residents of the Viewpoint area of the Overlake Neighborhood were not given the opportunity to be involved in the review, preparation and adoption of the neighborhood plan as required by NP-2:

- Residents of the Overlake Neighborhood were not included in the dialogue. Meetings with stakeholders focused exclusively on property owners or managers, commercial brokers, business owners or managers, and employees in Overlake. SEIS p.10; para. 1.7.1.1. The SEIS indicates that public notices were sent regarding Charettes to residents of Overlake and Grasslawn. However, no general notice mailing occurred to residents of the Viewpoint area of the Overlake Neighborhood. Verified via telephone conversation with Lori Peckol, Policy Planning Manager.

- The conversation regarding the future of the Overlake Neighborhood is not balanced. To-date, the conversation has been one-sided: dominated by the stakeholders who stand to benefit from the increased dimensional flexibility and allocation of square footage without engaging the residential stakeholders who will bear significant impacts associated with the growth proposed.

The Viewpoint and Overlake residential CAC's are constituted and preparing to begin their evaluation of the residential areas of the Overlake Neighborhood. These volunteers should be briefed on the Overlake Neighborhood Plan and given time to make a recommendation to the Planning Commission before the Planning Commission completes their final recommendation to Council. Participation from the neighborhood as a whole (including the residential stakeholders) did not occur for the development of the Overlake Neighborhood Update and is not consistent with the culture of dialogue contemplated by Framework Policy FW-3. The public participation and outreach that has occurred is not consistent with the requirements of the Comprehensive Plan.

Transportation

Transportation impacts associated with residential units and commercial square footage must be evaluated for the entire Overlake Neighborhood.

- Impacts on the Grasslawn Neighborhood were evaluated.
- Impacts on the Viewpoint area of the Overlake Neighborhood were not evaluated. A significant number of residential units are contemplated to occur in Overlake Village as a result of proposed new dimensional flexibility. Yet, there is no analysis that describes the impacts to residents of Viewpoint who travel through Overlake Village (on NE 24th Street) to gain access to the regional transportation system (SR 520).

Transportation analysis that includes Viewpoint is necessary for the Planning Commission to fully understand the range of impacts on Redmond residents and to ensure implementation strategies (including infrastructure financing, developer contributions and development phasing) are in place at the time of plan adoption. Additional transportation analysis is necessary to identify the improvements that would be needed to protect neighborhoods (FW-25). No additional residential or office development should be entitled before an appropriate financial plan is prepared and projects are funded to support growth so that the City can ensure that the cost of capital facility improvements are borne in proportion to the benefit received (FW-29).

Action should wait for the outcome of the Sound Transit light rail vote in fall 2007. Increases in both commercial square footage and housing units are likely to have significant impacts on transportation from the single family areas of the Overlake Neighborhood to regional transportation facilities (SR 520 and I-90 via West Lake Sammamish Parkway). Transportation analysis included in the SEIS assumes light rail will be in place. Since the vote on construction of Sound Transit light rail is scheduled for Fall 2007, the most prudent course of action would be to delay the Planning Commission recommendation on the plan until the transit vote is taken. At a minimum, additional height to facilitate housing and additional commercial square footage should not be entitled until transportation is planned and funded. Land use must be linked to transportation infrastructure.

Visual Analysis

The housing unit targets adopted in 1999 for Overlake Village cannot be achieved without additional building height allowances. Amendments requested by Group Health propose height limits up to 12 stories. Impacts associated with the increased height limits cannot be evaluated by the Planning Commission (or stakeholders involved in the process) in the absence of a visual analysis that accurately depicts the ultimate heights that are proposed.

Cross-Jurisdictional Collaboration

The cities of Redmond and Bellevue have an obligation to coordinate planning along their jurisdictional boundaries. At the June 13 meeting, Planning Commission members acknowledged that most residents do not know where the jurisdictional city limits are for the City of Redmond. However, residents should not have to know this information - jurisdictional lines should be transparent. As contemplated in Comprehensive Plan policy FW-25, interests of Redmond and Bellevue and nearby residential areas should all be taken into account when planning for the transportation future of this area. Bellevue is only about six months behind in its planning efforts for areas of Overlake that lie within Bellevue jurisdiction. New commercial square footage could not be entitled in the Redmond area of Overlake until 2012 in the absence of an amendment to the BROTS interlocal agreement between Bellevue and Redmond. It is irresponsible for these planning efforts to be run out of sync - they should run in collaboration in an effort to optimize regional transportation investment in the Overlake area (irrespective of jurisdictional lines) and to minimize impacts on and maintain stability of adjacent residential areas in both cities.

The Overlake Neighborhood plan is an example of balkanized planning. The process has divided commercial property owners and residential property owners, and Redmond planning from Bellevue planning. Effective plans include broad stakeholder engagement so that the end product truly reflects a shared vision for the future of a place. The realistic outcome of the current Overlake planning process is that nearby, existing, single family neighborhoods will be impacted by traffic; Redmond and Bellevue will compete for regional transportation infrastructure and funding; and, some commercial property owners will be up zone winners and some will be losers. However, these outcomes should be decided with the involvement of the full array of property stakeholders, with the benefit of the best information possible and with the good of the region (not just a single jurisdiction or a single stakeholder group) firmly in mind. Without these essential parts, the vision will not be shared and it will be difficult, if not impossible, to implement. Redmond should be a leader in collaborative planning for the benefit of its residents.

Redmond is committed to remaining a community of good neighbors, working together and with others in the region to implement a common vision for Redmond's future. (Comprehensive Plan; Redmond Goals). The Planning Commission should help to ensure that this planning effort is a success. Slow down the process, involve the residential stakeholders from the CACs that have been formed for the residential areas of the Overlake Neighborhood (including Viewpoint), sync the Redmond planning effort with the Bellevue planning effort for the Overlake area, expand the transportation analysis, be informed by the outcome of the Sound Transit light rail vote and require a visual analysis that depicts the height of the building forms that you are being asked to enable. Then, develop a recommendation that takes into account the good of the community as a whole (FW-2).

We appreciate the time and commitment that you make as Planning Commissioner and appreciate your consideration of the issues raised in this letter.

Respectfully,

Carol and Greg Helland
2626 - 181st Ave NE
Viewpoint Area of the Overlake Neighborhood

Lori Peckol

From: Laura Modawell [laura.modawell@verizon.net]
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2007 3:12 PM
To: Planning Commission
Subject: Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update

Ladies and Gentlemen on the Planning Commission:

As a resident of the Viewpoint neighborhood, we would like to echo the words of Carol and Greg Hellend: Slow down the process, involve the residential stakeholders from the CACs that have been formed for the residential areas of the Overlake Neighborhood (including Viewpoint), sync the Redmond planning effort with the Bellevue planning effort for the Overlake area, expand the transportation analysis, be informed by the outcome of the Sound Transit light rail vote and require a visual analysis that depicts the height of the building forms that you are being asked to enable. Then, develop a recommendation that takes into account the good of the community as a whole (FW-2)

Thank you for your consideration,

Laura and Mark Modawell
2618 185th Ave NE
Redmond WA 98052

06/20/2007

Jayme Jonas

From: donna brethauer [donnabret@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2007 10:19 PM
To: Jayme Jonas
Cc: Lori Peckol; Kim Dietz
Subject: RE: Overlake Neighborhood Plan Amendment

Hello--

As a prospective Viewpoint neighborhood CAC member, I attended this evening's planning commission meeting/public hearing and was somewhat surprised by information I heard there.

I understand that part of the current actions is the actual splitting off of the so-called Viewpoint neighborhood from Overlake, and that the ongoing process to date for Overlake has technically included Viewpoint such that the policies and decisions made pursuant to the Overlake process will have significant impact on the Viewpoint neighborhood and CAC process and outputs. I don't understand why, instead, the direction isn't to slow the process and include Viewpoint residents in the current Overlake process.

I would have assumed these activities would be transparent to residents of this area. They were not mentioned at the kickoff meeting for Viewpoint and I do not recall (in two years of residence here) receiving any public notifications pertaining to these plans. Also, the email below immediately *follows* the conclusion of two significant public hearings.

Can someone speak to these questions?

Also I would like to know how I can access the distribution list to which the message below and also Kim Dietz's message postponing the Viewpoint CAC appointment until [all the defining decisions are already made?] later this year. If participants in the kickoff meeting signed in with contact information, I would also be interested in how I can acquire that information. I hope to open a dialog with interested Viewpoint residents.

Thanks
 Donna Brethauer
 Viewpoint resident

From: "Jayme Jonas" <JJONAS@redmond.gov>
 To: "Jayme Jonas" <JJONAS@redmond.gov>
 CC: "Lori Peckol" <LPECKOL@redmond.gov>, "Kim Dietz" <KDIETZ@REDMOND.GOV>
 Subject: Overlake Neighborhood Plan Amendment
 Date: Fri, 1 Jun 2007 11:38:50 -0700

Dear potential Viewpoint Citizens Advisory Committee members,

As people involved in the community, we wanted to inform you about 2 proposals under consideration by the Redmond Planning Commission for the nearby neighborhood of Overlake. The first, a City-initiated proposal, would update the Overlake Neighborhood Plan policies and regulations and establish a Master Plan to guide development and investments in the neighborhood. The second, privately initiated by Group Health, would amend the Overlake Design District regulations.

06/21/2007

The Overlake Neighborhood Plan update project began in 2005 and has included a number of public meetings including a design workshop last May and two open houses (November 2006 and March 2007). The purpose of the Neighborhood Plan update is to clarify and enhance the policies and regulations that comprise the Overlake Neighborhood Plan, including land use; character and design; parks, recreation, open space and the arts; transportation; public facilities and services; and issues related to the three proposed subareas: Overlake Village (generally where Sears, Safeway and Group Health are located), Employment Area (generally where Microsoft and Nintendo are located), and Residential Area (generally Overlake's single-family residential neighborhoods). The intent of the existing neighborhood policies and regulations has been largely retained in the proposed update and new concepts such as promotion of housing, parks, and sustainable development are proposed to promote implementation of the existing neighborhood vision.

The request from Group Health is for revisions in the Overlake Design District regulations to focus on future opportunities to achieve a compact, mixed-use development on the site which can include substantial residential development, as well as employment, retail and public recreational opportunities served by transit. The request proposes that additional floor area and height, up to 12 stories, could be achieved on portions of this site through the provision of amenities such as a park space, due to the proximity of a high-capacity transit station, or to facilitate tree retention. The amendment is intended to recognize the special opportunity presented by this large site which is located adjacent to major employment centers and the Village at Overlake Station transit facility.

To learn more about these proposals and review documents related to each proposal, please visit the following website: <http://www.redmond.gov/insidecityhall/boards/planningreview.asp> and scroll down to the "Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Group Health Requested Amendment" section. There is also a great deal of information about the Overlake project on the Overlake web pages; the Overlake project home page is: <http://www.redmond.gov/intheworks/Overlake/default.asp>

The Planning Commission began consideration of these 2 items on May 23rd and began a public hearing on May 30th. The public hearing will remain open through the next 2 Planning Commission meetings: June 13th and 20th. We hope you will take the time to familiarize yourselves with these amendments and spread the word throughout your neighborhood so that others might be informed. If you have any questions or would like more information, please contact Lori Peckol (425-556-2411, lpeckol@redmond.gov) or Jayme Jonas (425-556-2496, jjonas@redmond.gov).

Sincerely,
Jayme Jonas

Jayme Jonas, Assistant Planner
Redmond Planning Department
15670 NE 85th Street, MS 4SPL
Redmond, WA 98073-9710
Phone: (425) 556-2496
Email: jjonas@redmond.gov

06/21/2007

Lori Peckol

From: Gail Rice [gail@silverstein-thomas-rice.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 14, 2007 8:11 AM
To: mayor@redmond.gov; Council; Planning Commission; Lori Peckol; Jayme Jonas
Subject: Overlake Planning

To our Redmond leaders:

I've become aware of the proposed changes to the Overlake area with a possible dramatic jump in density through the increased building height and residential housing configuration. I'm very concerned about traffic flow through that area as both my husband and I commute through that corridor daily (We are residents in the Brae Burn neighborhood who work in Bellevue and Seattle.) and are already finding the roads heavily congested at various times of day.

We would like to request that our neighborhood be more appropriately informed and our interests are taken into account prior to formulating a Council recommendation on this matter, particularly as it relates to the transportation impact all along NE 24th and where it connects to SR 520. I believe there is a CAC that exists to be a conduit between residents and the various planning organizations: please utilize the process and broaden your view of who will be impacted by these changes.

Sincerely,
Gail Rice

Gail Rice
Silverstein Thomas Rice and Associates
1000 N. Northlake Way, Ste. B
Seattle, WA 98103
p 206.633.0052 m 206.890.8848
fax 1-866-503-1051

08/15/2007

Lori Peckol

From: Christine Enslein [chrisensl@hotmail.com]
At: Tuesday, August 14, 2007 3:13 PM
Subject: mayor@redmond.gov; Council; Planning Commission
Overlake Transportation Planning

I am a resident of the Brae Burn community (near NE 24th St and 182nd Ave NE) and am concerned about the potential traffic impacts on the proposed housing developments in the Overlake area. I understand the need for high density housing near employment centers, however, I am concerned about a repeat of the Redmond Ridge/Avondale traffic debacle. Traffic solutions, including high functioning mass transit, need to be in place before 5800 new housing units are added to our area.

Traffic around Overlake impacts my family directly and substantially. We go to Overlake area for many daily tasks such as grocery shopping, banking, dry cleaning, office supplies and for access to SR 520. Please make sure NE 24th Street does not become the next Avondale Road.

I understand that because I live 2.5 east of the Overlake area that my neighborhood was not considered to be impacted by the planned housing development. Please understand that we will be impacted.

Chris Enslein
18221 NE 25th St
Redmond

See what you're getting into...before you go there
http://newlivehotmail.com/?ocid=TXT_TAGHM_migration_HM_viral_preview_0507

Jayme Jonas

From: Gregg Heinemann [heinemannfam@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, August 18, 2007 8:25 AM
To: mayor@redmond.gov
Cc: Council; Planning Commission
Subject: Overlake planning

We live in the Viewpoint neighborhood and will effected by the proposed actions. We would like to be included in the outreach necessary to inform the residents that will be most impacted by the changes proposed by Redmond staff.

Gregg and Kathy Heinemann
2500 148th Ave NE
Redmond, WA 98052

08/21/2007